

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DANIEL RODRIGUEZ,

No. C 14-80129 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

SEX OFFENDER TRACKING
PROGRAM,

**ORDER RE
PRE-FILING REVIEW**

Defendant.

Pro se Daniel Rodriguez is subject to pre-filing review. *Rodriguez v. City & County of San Francisco*, No. 3:08-cv-05257-MHP (N.D. Cal. Jan. 29, 2009) (Judge Marilyn Hall Patel) (Dkt. No. 14).

Mr. Rodriguez has filed numerous actions in this district. *See, e.g., Rodriguez v. Padilla*, No. 3:06-cv-03412-JSW, *Rodriguez v. Shiba*, No. 3:06-cv-03415-MJJ, *Rodriguez v. Go*, No. 3:06-cv-03416-MMC, *Rodriguez v. Shiba*, Case No. 3:06-cv-05757-MJJ, *Rodriguez v. Go*, No. 4:06-cv-05758-PJH, *Rodriguez v. Padilla et al.*, No. 4:06-cv-06044-SBA, *Rodriguez v. City of San Francisco*, No. 3:07-cv-00103-MMC, *Rodriguez v. Hamilton*, No. 3:07-cv-03518-MJJ, *Rodriguez v. Office of the Chief Counsel*, No. 3:07-cv-03519-JCS, *Rodriguez v. City and County of San Francisco*, No. 3:08-cv-02639-SI, *Rodriguez v. City and County of San Francisco*, No. 3:08-cv-04645-MMC, *Rodriguez v. City and County of San Francisco*, No. 3:08-cv-05257-MHP, *Rodriguez v. City and County of San Francisco et al.*, No. 3:08-cv-05452-CRB, *Rodriguez v. Commissioner of Social Security*,

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

1 No. 3:09-cv-02668-MMC, *Rodriguez v. Dalt Hotel, L.P.*, No. 3:09-cv-02777-JSW,
 2 *Rodriguez v. Greyhound Lines, Inc.*, No. 4:09-cv-02939-SBA, *Rodriguez v. Hennessey*,
 3 No. 4:10-cv-02249-PJH, *Rodriguez v. Aguirre*, No. 3:10-cv-04036-RS, *Rodriguez v. The*
 4 *Supreme Court and the People of the State of California*, No. 3:10-mc-80216-CRB,
 5 *Rodriguez v. Aguirre*, No. 3:10-mc-80217-CRB, *Rodriguez v. Barrett*, No. 3:11-cv-03562-WHA,
 6 *Rodriguez v. Barrett*, No. 3:13-mc-80003-EMC.

7 This time, Mr. Rodriguez filed a one-page “complaint dismissal of the Sex Offenders SF
 8 US. Police Department [sic].” The complaint alleged no specific facts. The entirety of the
 9 complaint stated:

10 Dismissal of the Sex Offender SF. U.S. Police Department
 11 Federal Rules of evidence, civil procedure 901 and 902
 12 State Rules 3.514 to Rules 3.524
 13 the case was solely as a probation condition. Pc 290
 14 Letter of Adult probation Department Hall of Justice from
 15 Sabrina Shumake [phone number]
 16 Many v. Dept of Social Services. 436 U.S. 645.98 S. Ct. 2018.
 17 561. Ed.2d 611(978)
 18 42 U.S.C. 1983 Claim. U.S. Government Law malpractice tort
 19 California Government Claims Act. Government code sections
 20 900 ET. Seq.
 21 Demand to Trail [sic]

22 Mr. Rodriguez appended a letter from the Chief Adult Probation Officer of the City and County
 23 of San Francisco to Mr. Rodriguez, dated February 4, 2014, which stated: “This is to confirm
 24 that Daniel Rodriguez is no longer on Probation in San Francisco County.”

25 The complaint fails to comply with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
 26 The complaint fails to plead any factual allegations, identify the grounds for jurisdiction, and
 27 state the relief requested. The Clerk is directed not to file the complaint.

28 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 9, 2014.


 WILLIAM ALSUP
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE